

From: David Acklam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 11:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The 'proposed settlement' does little to nothing to correct Microsoft's ability to abuse their monopoly position, specifically their desktop operating system and productivity software monopoly. It does not prevent them from running competitors out of business by bundling software into the OS, or (more importantly) do anything to encourage competition.

Microsoft's product quality is, to put it mildly, abysmal - and without serious competition in many areas, there is no motivation for them to improve. Even in areas where they lack market dominance (such as large network servers), they are able to leverage monopoly power from other areas and achieve similar effects as if they were dominant in these areas too.

As for counter-arguments, the most common one is that 'Microsoft's monopoly is good for consumers because it gives them product compatibility'. The largest flaws in this argument are that product compatibility can easily be achieved *by* competition (just look at the PC hardware industry, which has maintained compatibility without monopoly meddling), and that Microsoft does not use their power to provide compatibility, but rather harms consumers through planned incompatibility (by breaking older software to force upgrades).

Whatever Judge Jackson's actions, his initial remedy fit much better - at the very least, the 'settlement' should follow the lines of what the 9 non-settling states are proposing! That at least has a chance!